arXiv:1407.4444v1 [gr-qc] 16 Jul 2014

Effective constraint algebras with structure functions

Martin Bojowald* and Suddhasattwa Brahma†

Institute for Gravitation and the Cosmos,
The Pennsylvania State University,
104 Davey Lab, University Park, PA 16802, USA

Abstract

This article presents the result that fluctuations and higher moments of a state do not imply quantum corrections in structure functions of constrained systems. Consequences for canonical quantum gravity, whose structure functions encode space-time structure, are discussed. In particular, deformed algebras found in models of loop quantum gravity provide reliable information even in the Planck regime.

1 Introduction

Canonical gravity provides examples for constraint algebras with structure functions that depend on phase-space variables. With this feature, one cannot refer to well-known Lie algebra representation theory in order to find candidates for a quantization. Direct attempts to construct first-class quantizations of the constraints encounter several difficulties related to the anomaly problem and have, for the general theory of arbitrary gravitational fields and space-time geometries, not been successful. (There has been some progress in loop quantum gravity [1, 2, 3, 4, 5], but no anomaly-free off-shell algebra for the full theory is known yet.) Since complications appear at many different levels, it is useful to split the problem. Instead of (i) finding suitable Hilbert spaces (or other structures) to represent the constraints, (ii) constructing such representations, (iii) making sure that the resulting constraint operators obey a closed algebra and are therefore first class and anomaly-free, and then (iv) solving the constraint equations and trying to interpret physical states, we will in this article focus on the algebraic part of the problem: the effect of quantum corrections on possible algebraic relations between the constraints, amounting to part (iii) in our list. As we will see, not only can this question be addressed in isolation from the others; it also provides valuable insights about the quantum systems analyzed.

The first two steps of finding suitable Hilbert spaces and representations of the constraints can be circumvented by using the canonical effective formalism, briefly described below. As we will find, effective constraints (defined as expectation values of constraint operators in some family of states) allow one to draw rather strong conclusions about possible (or impossible) quantum constraint algebras even in regimes in which one does not expect semiclassical states to present good approximations. Such results are especially important

*e-mail address: bojowald@gravity.psu.edu
†e-mail address: sxb1012@psu.edu

in the context of possible Planckian quantum-gravity effects such as signature change in models of loop quantum gravity [6, 7, 8].

For a specific result on the form of constraint algebras, we refer to a quantum system subject to finitely many constraints $\hat{C}_I$, $I = 1, \ldots, N$ obeying an algebra

$$[\hat{C}_I, \hat{C}_J] = i\hbar \hat{f}^K_{IJ} \hat{C}_K \tag{1}$$

with structure functions f^K_{IJ}, turned into operators $\hat{f}^K_{IJ}$. We therefore assume that the corresponding classical system can, in some way, be quantized without anomalies. Since $\hat{f}^K_{IJ}$ is an operator, one could expect quantum corrections to modify the classical algebra $\{C_I, C_J\} = f^K_{IJ}(x_i)C_K$ (with phase-space functions $f^K_{IK}(x_i)$ depending on variables x_i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$) by fluctuation terms or other moments of a state: If effective constraints are defined as $\langle \hat{C}_I \rangle$, the expectation value taken in some states, their algebra might contain the expectation value $\langle \hat{f}^K_{IJ} \rangle$ which, for $f^K_{IJ}(x_i)$ non-linear in x_i, differs from the classical structure functions $f^K_{IJ}(\langle \hat{x}_i \rangle)$ by fluctuation terms and higher moments.

If this were the case, the quantization would be anomaly-free because the quantum and effective constraints would form closed systems. But the classical algebra of constraints, and therefore the gauge transformations they generate, would be deformed. In canonical gravity, the constraints generate gauge transformations that are equivalent to space-time diffeomorphisms on the solution space of the constraints. A deformation of the quantum or effective algebra would mean that the underlying space-time structure could no longer be given directly[1] by a Riemannian manifold with an invariant line element. Higher-curvature effective actions could not exist because the local form of covariance would be modified and no longer be respected by the usual curvature invariants. The form of curvature corrections is especially important in the Planck regime. Studying properties of anomaly-free constraint algebras can therefore provide useful clues for cosmological (and black-hole) scenarios.

Our main result will show that quantization, by itself, does not modify the constraint algebra at an effective level, provided that the constraint operators can directly be represented in an anomaly-free way and the structure functions are free of ordering ambiguities. By a careful analysis of effective constraints, as introduced in [10, 11], we will find that structure functions will not receive quantum corrections by fluctuations or moments of a state, even if they are non-linear in phase-space variables. In such a case, applied to gravity, the theory still has the standard space-time structure and may be expressed by a higher-curvature effective action. Deformations of the constraint algebra could appear only by non-trivial regularization steps or modifications that are sometimes required to introduce well-defined constraint operators, especially when methods of loop quantum gravity are used. In this way, unexpected and potentially significant new quantum space-time effects become possible. (See [12] for a review of such effects.)

[1] There are examples in which a deformed constraint algebra can be "undeformed" to the classical algebra by a canonical transformation [9]. One can then introduce effective space-times of the classical type after a field redefinition. However, such space-time structures are not obtained for direct quantizations of the classical metric.

2 Effective constraint algebras

Our starting point is a quantum system with basic operators $\hat{x}_i$, $i = 1, \ldots n$, constrained by N conditions that some operators $\hat{C}_I$, $I = 1, \ldots N$, annihilate physical states. We will not be concerned with the specific form of the kernel of all $\hat{C}_I$ as a physical Hilbert space, but only consider the important condition of off-shell closure of the algebra (1), a pre-requisite for the existence of a well-defined physical Hilbert space.

2.1 Effective constraints

We follow the definitions of effective constrained systems developed in [10, 11]. For every constraint operator $\hat{C}_I$, we introduce an infinite family of effective constraints

$$C_{I,\mathrm{pol}} := \langle \widehat{\mathrm{pol}} \hat{C}_I \rangle \tag{2}$$

with $\widehat{\mathrm{pol}}$ an arbitrary polynomial in $\widehat{\Delta x_i} := \hat{x}_i - \langle \hat{x}_i \rangle$, whose coefficients may be functions of basic expectation values $\langle \hat{x}_i \rangle$. We do not fix any state to compute these expectation values, but rather view expressions such as $\langle \hat{x}_i \rangle$ or $\langle \hat{C}_I \rangle$ as functions on the space of all states. Instead of using the Dirac quantization condition $\hat{C}_I \psi = 0$ for wave functions ψ, we impose infinitely many conditions $C_{I,\mathrm{pol}} = 0$ which require all expectation values and moments of the constraints to vanish. The specific ordering chosen in (2) guarantees that the effective constraints are first class if the constraint operators are first class. However, since no symmetric ordering is assumed, so that $\hat{C}_I$ always acts directly on the state, some effective constraints in general take complex values. (See the appendix of [13] for more details on complex terms in effective constraints.) We require reality (and positivity of the state as determined by uncertainty relations [14, 15]) of expectation values and moments only after the effective constrained system has been solved, amounting to a transition from kinematical to physical states.

An infinite set of effective constraints is difficult to solve. It can, approximately, be reduced to finite sets if we introduce, for all $a_1 + \cdots + a_n \geq 2$, the moments

$$\Delta(x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n}) := \langle (\widehat{\Delta x_1})^{a_1} \cdots (\widehat{\Delta x_n})^{a_n} \rangle_{\mathrm{Weyl}} \tag{3}$$

in totally symmetric (or Weyl) ordering. In a semiclassical state, the $\hbar$ierarchy

$$\Delta(x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n}) = O(\hbar^{(a_1+\cdots+a_n)/2}) \tag{4}$$

allows us to expand the effective constraints by powers of $\hbar$. At any fixed order, only a finite number of moments contributes, subject to a finite number of effective constraints.

If we assume an operator such as a constraint $\hat{C}$ to be Weyl-ordered, we can write its expectation value $\langle \hat{C} \rangle$ as a function of the state parameterized by its basic expectation values and moments:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{C} \rangle &= \langle C(\hat{x}_i) \rangle = \langle C(\langle \hat{x}_i \rangle + (\hat{x}_i - \langle \hat{x}_i \rangle)) \rangle \\ &= C(\langle \hat{x}_i \rangle) + \sum_{a_1,\ldots,a_n} \frac{1}{a_1! \cdots a_n!} \frac{\partial^{a_1+\cdots+a_n} C(\langle \hat{x}_i \rangle)}{\partial \langle \hat{x}_1 \rangle^{a_1} \cdots \partial \langle \hat{x}_n \rangle^{a_n}} \Delta(x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n}) \,. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

(This type of expansion is the same as used for Hamiltonians in unconstrained systems, where it has been shown to produce correct low-energy effective actions for anharmonic oscillators as well as higher time derivatives in an adiabatic approximation [16, 17, 18].) If $\hat{C}$ is a polynomial in basic operators, the expansion ends after a finite number of terms and is exact; it simply rewrites a polynomial in basic operators $\hat{x}_i$ as a polynomial in $\widehat{\Delta x_i} = \hat{x}_i - \langle\hat{x}_i\rangle$ with coefficients depending on $\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle$. Otherwise, the expansion is formal and acquires the meaning of an $\hbar$-expansion upon using (4). If $\hat{C}$ is a polynomial in basic operators that is not Weyl-ordered or not even symmetrically ordered, one can always write it as a sum of Weyl-ordered terms (see for instance [14, 19]). If the ordering is not symmetric, some coefficients of these Weyl-ordered terms will be complex. In what follows, we will assume all constraints $\hat{C}_I$ to be polynomial in basic operators, but do not restrict the ordering. Non-polynomial constraints would give rise to formal power series in our statements.

Details of this expansion and the orders considered for different terms will be important in what follows; see [14, 20] for more details. A moment of degree $a_1 + \cdots + a_n$ is of the order $\hbar^{(a_1+\cdots+a_n)/2}$ according to (4), while expectation values of the basic operators $\hat{x}_i$ are considered to be of order zero. However, when we impose effective constraints we will be forced to mix these orders. For instance, if $\hat{C} = \hat{p}^2$ is the square of a canonical momentum, the effective constraint equation $\langle\hat{C}\rangle = \langle\hat{p}\rangle^2 + \Delta(p^2) = 0$ identifies a zeroth-order function $\langle\hat{p}\rangle^2$ with a first-order variable $\Delta(p^2) = (\Delta p)^2$. For consistency, we therefore declare that the classical constraints $C_I(\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle) =: C_I^{\rm class}$ evaluated in expectation values of basic operators are not of degree zero but of degree two (or of the order of $\hbar$).

In order to be able to compute constraint algebras at the effective level, we use a Poisson structure on the space of expectation values and moments. For expectation values of some operators $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ (not necessarily basic ones),

$$\{\langle\hat{A}\rangle, \langle\hat{B}\rangle\} := \frac{\langle[\hat{A},\hat{B}]\rangle}{i\hbar} \tag{6}$$

is linear and satisfies the Jacobi identity. We extend it to arbitrary functions of expectation values (such as the moments) by requiring the Leibniz rule. Restricted to moments of some fixed maximum order, the Poisson structure given by (6) is in general not symplectic. For canonical $\hat{x}_i$, we have $\{\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle, \Delta(\cdots)\} = 0$ for all moments, and there is a closed but lengthy formula for Poisson brackets of moments [21]. An important property of the latter is that the Poisson bracket of a moment of order m and one of order n is of the order $n + m - 2$.

We can directly apply this Poisson bracket in order to derive useful statements about effective constraint algebras. If we have (1), we can easily derive

$$\begin{aligned}[\widehat{\rm pol}_\alpha\hat{C}_I, \widehat{\rm pol}_\beta\hat{C}_J] &= \Big(\widehat{\rm pol}_\alpha\widehat{\rm pol}_\beta\hat{f}_{IJ}^K + \widehat{\rm pol}_\alpha[\hat{C}_I, \widehat{\rm pol}_\beta]\delta_J^K + \widehat{\rm pol}_\beta[\widehat{\rm pol}_\alpha, \hat{C}_J]\delta_I^K \\ &\quad + [\widehat{\rm pol}_\alpha, \widehat{\rm pol}_\beta]\hat{C}_J\delta_I^K\Big)\hat{C}_K \\ &=: \hat{F}^K_{I\alpha,J\beta}\hat{C}_K\,,\end{aligned}$$

referring to some numbering of polynomials indicated by Greek indices. This calculation, using standard relationships of commutators, implies that the effective constraints obey an

algebra

$$\{C_{I,\mathrm{pol}_\alpha}, C_{J,\mathrm{pol}_\beta}\} = \sum_K C_{K,F^K_{I\alpha,J\beta}} \tag{7}$$

which is not only closed, but (formally) free of structure functions. (We obtain $F^K_{I\alpha,J\beta}$ as a polynomial in $\widehat{\Delta x_i}$ by inserting $\hat{x}_i = \widehat{\Delta x_i} + \langle \hat{x}_i \rangle$ in $\hat{F}^K_{I\alpha,J\beta}$.) The former structure functions rather appear as effective constraints (2) with higher-order polynomial coefficients. (Similarly, one can formally eliminate structure functions in operator algebras (1) by extending the original constrained system $\{\hat{C}_I\}$ by new constraints

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{C}_{IJ} &:= [\hat{C}_I, \hat{C}_J] = \hat{f}^K_{IJ}\hat{C}_K && (8)\\
\hat{C}_{LIJ} &:= [\hat{C}_L, \hat{f}^K_{IJ}\hat{C}_K] && (9)\\
\hat{C}_{MLIJ} &:= [\hat{C}_M, \hat{C}_{LIJ}] && (10)\\
&\ldots\\
\hat{C}_{NM\ldots} &:= [\hat{C}_N, \hat{C}_{M\ldots}]\,. && (11)
\end{aligned}$$

In general, this procedure yields infinitely many constraint operators, spanning a subset of the left-ideal generated by $\hat{C}_I$ in the algebra of operators on a kinematical Hilbert space. The left-ideal corresponds to the set of all constraints $C_{I,\mathrm{pol}}$, while $\hat{C}_{IJ\ldots}$ are those whose expectation values appear in the expansion (7).)

2.2 Closure

The latter result is only formal and does not help very much for practical purposes. Instead, we use (7) to conclude, following [10], that a closed (first-class) algebra of quantum constraints implies a closed (first-class) algebra of effective constraints. Moreover, if one expands all parts of (7) up to some order in $\hbar$ or in moments, the reduced effective constraints obey a closed algebra to within this order: As noted after (6), the Poisson bracket of two moments of orders m and n, respectively, is of the order $m + n - 2 \geq \min(m, n)$. Taking Poisson brackets therefore commutes with truncating by orders of $\hbar$.

Effective constraint algebras can provide conclusions about possible forms of quantum constraint algebras in models in which the latter are difficult to find. For instance, if one can show that it is not possible for certain types of effective constraints to close up to some order in $\hbar$, a closed set of constraint operators quantizing the same system cannot exist. For general statements, one may introduce suitable parameters in effective constraints to take into account quantization ambiguities, such as factor ordering. Some of these choices could then be ruled out if they were to lead to anomalous effective algebras to some order. A second set of results can be found when effective constraints of a certain type can be anomaly-free, but only if the constraint algebra is deformed compared to the classical one. One can then conclude that the quantum constraint algebra must be deformed as well. A large class of such examples exists in loop quantum gravity with holonomy or inverse-triad corrections [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28].

These conclusions about possible constraint algebras turn out to be rather powerful. They would be valid even if the $\hbar$-orders used gave rise to poor approximations of the dynamics generated on the solution space of the constraints. Indeed, the conclusions we inferred are off-shell statements independent of properties of the solution space of the constraints. In quantum gravity, provided one studies a sufficiently large class of effective constraints with parameterizations of all expected ambiguities, the form of constraint algebras and the corresponding space-time structures can therefore be considered reliable even in the Planck regime, in which an $\hbar$-expansion of the dynamics may be doubtful.

2.3 Moments do not deform constraint algebras

By definition of the Poisson bracket (6) on state space, the leading part of the effective constraint algebra is given by $\{C_{I,1}, C_{J,1}\} = \langle \hat{f}^K_{IJ}\hat{C}_K\rangle$ evaluated for constant polynomials $\mathrm{pol}_\alpha = \mathrm{pol}_\beta = 1$. The right-hand side contains fluctuations and higher moments if it is expanded by (5). (Or rather, by applying (5) after ordering the product of $\hat{f}^K_{IJ}$ and $\hat{C}_K$ totally symmetrically in basic operators. Even though the product in the given ordering may not even be symmetric, it can, as noted, always be written as a sum of totally symmetric terms some of which may have complex coefficients.) If the expansion would look like $\langle \hat{f}^K_{IJ}\hat{C}_K\rangle = \langle \hat{f}^K_{IJ}\rangle\langle\hat{C}_K\rangle + \Delta(\cdots)$, where $\Delta(\cdots)$ indicates any kind of moment term that vanishes when effective constraints $C_{I,\mathrm{pol}}$ for non-constant pol are satisfied, the classical structure functions would be subject to quantum corrections in the effective algebra, applying (5) to $\langle \hat{f}^K_{IJ}\rangle$. However, such an expectation value appears in the moment expansion only if the $\hat{C}_K$ are basic operators, in which case there could not be structure functions.

Instead of producing corrections to the structure functions, the expansion (5) introduces higher-order effective constraints $C_{I,\mathrm{pol}}$: $\langle \hat{f}^K_{IJ}\hat{C}_K\rangle = \sum_K C_{K,f^K_{IJ}}$. In order to make this series more explicit, we continue with two assumptions and then discuss consequences depending on whether they are satisfied. For now, we assume that:

(i) The $\hat{f}^K_{IJ}$ *faithfully quantize* the classical structure functions f^K_{IJ}, that is, $\hat{f}^K_{IJ} = f^K_{IJ}(\hat{x}_i)$ in some ordering of basic operators, using the classical structure functions $f^K_{IJ}(x_i)$.

(ii) The quantized structure functions $\hat{f}^K_{IJ}$ are *Weyl-ordered.*

With these assumptions, we can, by (i), rewrite

$$\langle \hat{f}^K_{IJ}\hat{C}_K\rangle = \langle f^K_{IJ}(\widehat{\Delta x_i} + \langle\hat{x}_i\rangle)\hat{C}_K\rangle$$

and, by (ii), expand

$$f^K_{IJ}(\widehat{\Delta x_i}+\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle) = f^K_{IJ}(\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle) + \sum_{a_1,\ldots a_n} \frac{1}{a_1!\cdots a_n!}\frac{\partial^{a_1+\cdots+a_n} f^K_{IJ}(\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle)}{\partial\langle\hat{x}_1\rangle^{a_1}\cdots\partial\langle\hat{x}_n\rangle^{a_n}}\left((\widehat{\Delta x_1})^{a_1}\cdots(\widehat{\Delta x_n})^{a_n}\right)_{\mathrm{Weyl}} \tag{12}$$

as used in (5). Thus,

$$\{C_{I,1}, C_{J,1}\} = \langle \hat{f}^K_{IJ}\hat{C}_K\rangle = f^K_{IJ}(\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle)C_{K,1} + \sum_j \frac{\partial f^K_{IJ}(\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle)}{\partial\langle\hat{x}_j\rangle}C_{K,x_j} + \cdots \tag{13}$$

with structure functions $f^K_{IJ}(\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle)$ multiplying leading effective constraints $C_{K,1} = \langle\hat{C}_K\rangle$ and higher-order constraints $C_{K,x_i} = \langle\widehat{\Delta x_i}\hat{C}_K\rangle$ with their own new structure functions depending on $\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle$, and so on. The form of effective constraints and moment expansions makes it clear that structure functions are not corrected by quantum terms, provided our two assumptions of faithful and Weyl-ordered structure functions are satisfied. Quantization then implies only the presence of new kinematical degrees of freedom and constraints in the algebra. Classical and quantum degrees of freedom (expectation values and moments) may be mixed by gauge flows generated by the constraints, as shown by new terms in (13). But the leading structure functions $f^K_{IJ}(\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle)$ are left unmodified, and new structure functions such as $\partial f^K_{IJ}(\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle)/\partial\langle\hat{x}_j\rangle$ in (13) do not depend on moments and are strictly related to the leading structure functions $f^K_{IJ}(\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle)$. This conclusion is correct to all orders, no matter how far one expands in (13). Moments may, however, appear in new structure functions for brackets that involve higher-order constraints. For instance, using commutator relationships and some of the methods of [20], we compute

$$\{C_{I,1}, C_{J,\mathrm{pol}}\} = \frac{1}{i\hbar}\left(\langle[\hat{C}_I, \widehat{\mathrm{pol}}]\hat{C}_J\rangle + \sum_i \left\langle \frac{\partial\widehat{\mathrm{pol}}}{\partial\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle}\hat{C}_J\right\rangle \langle[\hat{C}_I,\hat{x}_i]\rangle\right) + \langle\widehat{\mathrm{pol}}\hat{f}^K_{IJ}\hat{C}_K\rangle \quad (14)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\{C_{M,x_i}, C_{N,x_j}\} &= \frac{1}{i\hbar}\left(\langle[\widehat{\Delta x_i}\hat{C}_M, \widehat{\Delta x_j}\hat{C}_N]\rangle - \langle[\hat{x}_i, \widehat{\Delta x_j}\hat{C}_N]\rangle C_{M,1} - \langle[\widehat{\Delta x_i}\hat{C}_M, \hat{x}_j]\rangle C_{N,1}\right)\\ &\quad + C_{M,1}C_{N,1}\{\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle, \langle\hat{x}_j\rangle\} \qquad (15)\end{aligned}$$

for monomials pol, and so on. By expanding some of the remaining coefficients and commutators using (12), one obtains new structure functions with moment contributions. We will make this explicit in a further analysis of (14) below.

Possible corrections to the classical structure functions can appear only in two cases. First, if $\hat{f}^K_{IJ}$ cannot be obtained in Weyl ordering for a first-class constraint algebra, that is if assumption (i) but not (ii) is satisfied, there may be re-ordering terms in the expansion (12) which depend explicitly on $\hbar$. Such terms, evaluated for expectation values, would be added to $f^K_{IJ}(\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle)$ in (13) and therefore present quantum corrections to the structure functions. However, they do not come from moments but rather from a function depending on $\hbar$ and $\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle$.

Secondly, a deformed quantum algebra implies a deformed effective algebra. If one has to regularize or modify the classical constraints in order to represent them, assumption (i) is violated and the quantum structure functions $\hat{f}^K_{IJ} = f^K_{IJ,\mathrm{reg}}(\hat{x}_i)$ are not directly obtained by inserting basic operators in the classical structure functions. Accordingly, the expansion in (13) gives leading structure functions $f^K_{IJ,\mathrm{reg}}(\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle) \neq f^K_{IJ}(\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle)$ not identical with the classical ones. (But still, the deformed structure functions of effective constraints $C_{I,1}$ do not depend on moments.) This is the case of interest in loop quantum gravity, which we will discuss in more detail in the conclusions.

2.4 The classical algebra within the effective system

As noted, there are no quantum corrections in the constraint algebra (13), but only new constraints for the quantum degrees of freedom. The classical and undeformed constraint algebra could be extracted from (13) if there were consistent partial solutions of the constrained system, solving all constraints in the set

$$\mathcal{C} := \left\{ C_{K,x_1^{i_1}\cdots x_n^{i_n}} : (i_1,\ldots,i_n) \neq (0,\cdots,0) \text{ such that } \frac{\partial^{i_1+\cdots+i_n} f^K_{IJ}(\langle\hat{x}_i\rangle)}{\partial\langle\hat{x}_1\rangle^{i_1}\cdots\partial\langle\hat{x}_n\rangle^{i_n}} \neq 0 \right\} \tag{16}$$

(or all constraints in a larger set containing $\mathcal{C}$ but none of the $C_{I,1}$). For the partially solved system, an undeformed algebra for the $C_{I,1}$ would then be obtained as a subalgebra within the remaining effective constraint algebra. This subalgebra would be an exact and uncorrected version of the classical algebra, even though the generators $C_{I,1}$ in general differ from the classical constraints by quantum corrections.

However, it is not easy to find consistent partial solutions. For the set $\mathcal{C}$ to be solvable consistently, it must form an ideal in the full constraint algebra. The remaining constraints are then well-defined on the partially reduced phase space obtained by factoring out the kernel of the pre-symplectic form given by the pull-pack of the original symplectic form to the partial constraint surface. In terms of Poisson structures (which one has to use if the system of moments is truncated), one can consistently factor out the Hamiltonian flow generated by constraints in $\mathcal{C}$. A Poisson structure is then defined by requiring the embedding i of the partial constraint surface to be a Poisson map: $\{i^*f, i^*g\} = i^*\{f,g\}$ for all functions f and g on the full phase space. The left-hand side defines a Poisson bracket for all functions that weakly commute with the constraints in $\mathcal{C}$: if $i^*f_1 = i^*f_2$, $f_2 = f_1 + C_f$ with some function C_f that vanishes on the partial constraint surface, and similarly $g_2 = g_1 + C_g$ if $i^*g_1 = i^*g_2$. The Poisson bracket is well-defined if $i^*\{f_1,g_1\} = i^*\{f_2,g_2\}$, that is if $i^*\{C_f,g\} = 0$ and $i^*\{C_f,C_g\} = 0$ for all C_f and C_g that vanish on the partial constraint surface. For the latter condition, the constraints in $\mathcal{C}$ must form a subalgebra. For the former, applied to the unsolved constraints which should have consistent Poisson brackets with one another, the constraints in $\mathcal{C}$ must form an ideal.

In order to explore the conditions on an ideal, we evaluate the relations (14) and (15) in more detail. We begin with (14) for a monomial $\widehat{\mathrm{pol}} = \widehat{\Delta x_i}$, in which case we have

$$\{C_{I,1}, C_{J,x_i}\} = \langle (\hat{K}_{Ii} - \langle\hat{K}_{Ii}\rangle)\hat{C}_J\rangle + \langle \widehat{\Delta x_i}\hat{f}^K_{IJ}\hat{C}_K\rangle\,, \tag{17}$$

defining $\hat{K}_{Ii} := [\hat{C}_I,\hat{x}_i]/i\hbar$. In the last term, we can expand $\hat{f}^K_{IJ}$ as in (12), showing that only higher-order constraints contribute. However, the first term may contribute constraints $C_{J,1}$: We expand $\hat{K}_{Ii}$ as in (12) and, denoting by a weak equality an equation up to higher-order constraints, obtain

$$\{C_{I,1}, C_{J,x_i}\} \approx -\sum_{\sum j_k\geq 2} \frac{1}{j_1!\cdots j_n!}\frac{\partial^{j_1+\cdots+j_n}K_{Ii}}{\partial\langle\hat{x}_1\rangle^{j_1}\cdots\partial\langle\hat{x}_n\rangle^{j_n}}\Delta(x_1^{j_1}\cdots x_n^{j_n})C_{J,1}\,. \tag{18}$$

The coefficients vanish for quadratic constraints, but in such a case there could not be structure functions. In general, therefore, the higher-order constraints cannot form an ideal. (Incidentally, (18) shows that moments do appear in structure functions involving higher-order constraints. However, these moments are not corrections to classical structure functions since higher-order constraints have no classical analog.) Moreover, the relation (15) implies that higher-order constraints in general do not even form a subalgebra: Even if we restrict the x_i in (15) to those that appear in structure functions, and even if we assume that these x_i all commute with one another, the last terms in (15) may be non-zero but proportional to the constraints $C_{I,1}$ which are not contained in $\mathcal{C}$.

Since it is, in general, not expected to have the rather strong condition of an ideal satisfied, it is not always easy to reduce the effective constraint algebra to one that exactly equals the classical one. If $\mathcal{C}$ does not form an ideal but a sub-algebra, there is a well-defined Poisson structure on the partial solution space, but Poisson brackets of some of the remaining constraints depend on the embedding i and not just on the partial constraint surface as a subspace. In such a case, there is no unique reduced constraint algebra, but one can find different realizations depending on the specific embedding. We will illustrate this possibility in more detail by an example in the following section.

3 Example

As an example, we consider a totally constrained system with two canonical pairs $(q_1, p_1; q_2, p_2)$ as basic operators and two constraints $C_{1,\mathrm{class}} = q_1 + q_2^3$, $C_{2,\mathrm{class}} = q_1 q_2^2 p_1 + \frac{1}{3} q_2^3 p_2$. Since we are interested in the off-shell algebra, a totally constrained system has non-trivial properties.

It is easy to see that the operators $\hat{C}_1 = \hat{q}_1 + \hat{q}_2^3$ and $\hat{C}_2 = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{q}_1\hat{p}_1 + \hat{p}_1\hat{q}_1)\hat{q}_2^2 + \frac{1}{3}\,(\hat{q}_2^3\hat{p}_2)_{\mathrm{Weyl}}$ provide a first-class representation with structure functions in the algebra

$$[\hat{C}_1, \hat{C}_2] = i\hbar\hat{q}_2^2\hat{C}_1\,. \tag{19}$$

(The totally symmetric ordering of $\hat{C}_2$ is convenient but not necessary.) In order to see potential fluctuation terms in structure functions, we should expand effective constraints at least to fourth order in $\hbar$. In the present case, we can use exact expressions for the relevant constraints.

We have

$$C_{1,1} = \langle\hat{C}_1\rangle = \langle\hat{q}_1\rangle + \langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^3 + 3\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\Delta(q_2^2) + \Delta(q_2^3) \tag{20}$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_{2,1} = \langle\hat{C}_2\rangle &= \langle\hat{q}_1\rangle\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2\langle\hat{p}_1\rangle + \frac{1}{3}\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^3\langle\hat{p}_2\rangle \\ &\quad + 2\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\langle\hat{p}_1\rangle\Delta(q_1q_2) + 2\langle\hat{q}_1\rangle\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\Delta(q_2p_1) + (\langle\hat{q}_1\rangle\langle\hat{p}_1\rangle + \langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\langle\hat{p}_2\rangle)\Delta(q_2^2) \\ &\quad + \langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2(\Delta(q_1p_1) + \Delta(q_2p_2)) \\ &\quad + \langle\hat{p}_1\rangle\Delta(q_1q_2^2) + 2\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\Delta(q_1q_2p_1) + \langle\hat{q}_1\rangle\Delta(q_2^2p_1) + \frac{1}{3}\langle\hat{p}_2\rangle\Delta(q_2^3) + \langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\Delta(q_2^2p_2) \\ &\quad + \Delta(q_1q_2^2p_1) + \frac{1}{3}\Delta(q_2^3p_2)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

We will need several Poisson brackets of moments of order larger than two, which can be found using the general formula given in [21]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\Delta(q_2^2),\Delta(q_2^2p_2)\} &= 2\Delta(q_2^3) && (22)\\
\{\Delta(q_2^2),\Delta(q_2^3p_2)\} &= 2\Delta(q_2^4) && (23)\\
\{\Delta(q_2^3),\Delta(q_2p_2)\} &= 3\Delta(q_2^3) && (24)\\
\{\Delta(q_2^3),\Delta(q_2^2p_2)\} &= -3\Delta(q_2^2)^2+3\Delta(q_2^4) && (25)\\
\{\Delta(q_2^3),\Delta(q_2^3p_2)\} &= -3\Delta(q_2^2)\Delta(q_2^3)+3\Delta(q_2^5)\,. && (26)
\end{aligned}$$

The effective constraint algebra is then

$$\begin{aligned}
\{C_{1,1},C_{2,1}\} &= \langle\hat{q}_1\rangle\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2+\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^5+(10\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^3+\langle\hat{q}_1\rangle)\Delta(q_2^2)+2\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\Delta(q_1q_2)\\
&\quad +\Delta(q_1q_2^2)+10\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2\Delta(q_2^3)+5\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\Delta(q_2^4)+\Delta(q_2^5) && (27)\\
&= \langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2C_{1,1}+2\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle C_{1,q_2}+C_{1,q_2^2}\,. && (28)
\end{aligned}$$

We have used the effective constraints

$$C_{1,q_2}=\langle\widehat{\Delta q_2}\hat{C}_1\rangle=\Delta(q_1q_2)+3\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2\Delta(q_2^2)+3\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\Delta(q_2^3)+\Delta(q_2^4) \tag{29}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{1,q_2^2}=\langle(\widehat{\Delta q_2})^2\hat{C}_1\rangle &= \left(\langle\hat{q}_1\rangle+\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^3\right)\Delta(q_2^2) && (30)\\
&\quad +\Delta(q_1q_2^2)+3\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2\Delta(q_2^3)+3\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\Delta(q_2^4)+\Delta(q_2^5)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

This specific example agrees with the general expansion (13). In particular, the quadratic quantum structure function $\hat{q}_2^2$ does not give rise to fluctuation corrections in effective structure functions. If we had tried to absorb some part of C_{1,q_2^2} in $\Delta(q_2^2)C_{1,1}$, we would have been left with unconstrained terms in

$$\begin{aligned}
\{C_{1,1},C_{2,1}\} &= \left(\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2+\Delta(q_2^2)\right)C_{1,1}+2\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle C_{1,q_2}\\
&\quad +3\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2\Delta(q_2^3)+\Delta(q_1q_2^2)+3\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\left(\Delta(q_2^4)-\Delta(q_2^2)^2\right)\\
&\quad +\Delta(q_2^5)-\Delta(q_2^2)\Delta(q_2^3)\,. && (31)
\end{aligned}$$

The relation (28) does not have exactly the classical form because new constraints C_{1,q_2} and C_{1,q_2^2} appear, as a consequence of moments as new quantum degrees of freedom. The higher-order constraints C_{1,q_2} and C_{1,q_2^2}, in this case, form a subalgebra but not an ideal: $\{C_{2,1},C_{1,q_2}\}=-2\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\Delta(q_2^2)C_{1,1}-2\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2C_{1,q_2}$. If partial solutions are used, the Poisson brackets of reduced constraints depend on the embedding of the partial constraint surface.

For the sake of brevity, we illustrate the resulting algebra up to first order in $\hbar$ (or second-order moments), in which case C_{1,q_2} is the only constraint in (28) without a classical analog. We use this constraint to eliminate the fluctuation $\Delta(q_2^2)$ from our constraints by

replacing it with $\Delta(q_2^2) = -\frac{1}{3}\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^{-2}\Delta(q_1q_2)$ in $C_{1,1}$ and $C_{2,1}$ and whenever it appears in Poisson brackets:

$$C'_{1,1} = \langle\hat{C}_1\rangle|_{\Delta(q_2^2)=-\frac{1}{3}\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^{-2}\Delta(q_1q_2)} = \langle\hat{q}_1\rangle + \langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^3 - \frac{1}{\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle}\Delta(q_1q_2) \tag{32}$$

$$\begin{aligned} C'_{2,1} &= \langle\hat{C}_2\rangle|_{\Delta(q_2^2)=-\frac{1}{3}\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^{-2}\Delta(q_1q_2)} = \langle\hat{q}_1\rangle\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2\langle\hat{p}_1\rangle + \frac{1}{3}\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^3\langle\hat{p}_2\rangle \\ &\quad + \left(2\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\langle\hat{p}_1\rangle - \frac{\langle\hat{q}_1\rangle\langle\hat{p}_1\rangle + \langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\langle\hat{p}_2\rangle}{3\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2}\right)\Delta(q_1q_2) \\ &\quad + 2\langle\hat{q}_1\rangle\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle\Delta(q_2p_1) + \langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2(\Delta(q_1p_1) + \Delta(q_2p_2))\,. \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

These new constraints satisfy the algebra

$$\begin{aligned} \{C'_{1,1}, C'_{2,1}\} &= \langle\hat{q}_1\rangle\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2 + \langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^5 + \frac{\langle\hat{q}_1\rangle - 2\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^3}{3\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2}\Delta(q_1q_2) \\ &= \langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2 C'_{1,1} + \frac{\Delta(q_1q_2)}{3\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2}\left(C'_{1,1} + \frac{1}{\langle\hat{q}_2\rangle}\Delta(q_1q_2)\right) \\ &= \langle\hat{q}_2\rangle^2 C'_{1,1} + O(2)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Within the orders considered, the algebra is identical with the classical one even though the constraints $C'_{1,1}$ and $C'_{2,1}$ contain quantum corrections.

4 Conclusions

We have shown, by Eq. (13), that quantum back-reaction by moments of a state on expectation values does not lead to deformations of constraint algebras in anomaly-free quantizations, even though the constraints themselves receive quantum corrections. In the remainder of this article we discuss two applications of our general result to canonical quantum gravity. For this, we need to assume that one can extend our constructions to systems with infinitely many constraints and degrees of freedom, or that the local dynamics of quantum gravity can be expressed in terms of finitely many degrees of freedom as for instance in some discrete versions. We also assume that non-polynomial constraints can be dealt with by the methods of this article using formal power series. Classically, there are then structure functions which depend on the metric of a spatial slice within space-time, or on the configuration variables but not on the momenta in a canonical formulation such as [29].

4.1 Quantum space-time structures

The first consequence of our result is the presence of a state-independent space-time structure. Structure functions which encode hypersurface deformations in space-time [30], corresponding to our $C_{K,1}$, do not depend on moments of a state, but only on expectation values which are in one-to-one correspondence with the classical degrees of freedom. Just

as classical gravity has a Riemannian space-time structure irrespective of which dynamical equations one solves for the metric, canonical quantum gravity gives rise to a well-defined space-time structure with algebraic relations of hypersurface-deformation generators irrespective of equations satisfied by quantum states. (However, quantization always introduces new degrees of freedom with independent gauge transformations that contribute to the algebra. Their commutation relations may depend more sensitively on the state.)

If the constrained system can be quantized faithfully, it has Weyl-ordered structure functions because the f_{IJ}^K of classical gravity depend only on configuration variables. As shown here, faithfulness implies that there are no modifications to the classical space-time structure and its covariance. Effective actions should therefore be of higher-curvature form with the standard notion of covariance and Riemannian space-time structures.

The higher-curvature form of quantum corrections makes use of an additional assumption, namely that there is a local effective action obtained after a valid derivative expansion. In terms of moments in canonical effective descriptions, the analog of a derivative expansion is an adiabaticity condition for the moments [16, 17, 18]. If moments do not change adiabatically in a certain regime, the corrections they imply cannot be expressed by higher-derivative terms in effective equations, and there is no local effective action in terms of the classical fields. However, a non-local effective action can be rewritten as a local effective action with auxiliary fields which, from a formal perspective, turn out to be just the moments, seen as independent degrees of freedom. (In general, moments are far from being just auxiliary degrees of freedom. Still, they can formally serve such a purpose in an effective action.) In either case, the theory, local or non-local, enjoys the classical space-time structure and gauge behavior if the canonical constraint algebra is undeformed.

At present, it is, of course, unkown if canonical gravity can be quantized in an anomaly-free way. Nevertheless, the conclusion is in agreement with results from non-canonical derivations of effective actions of gravity [31, 32]. In this context, our results reconcile the covariant and canonical view, and thereby provide support for the canonical effective approach.

4.2 Signature change

In models of loop quantum gravity, an alternative canonical approach to quantize gravity, deformed constraint algebras have been found in a variety of systems and with different methods. Some of them have been derived for effective constraints that do not include moments but other characteristic quantum-geometry corrections expected from loop quantizations: inverse-triad corrections [22, 23] and holonomy modifications [24, 26, 27, 28]. The deformed constraint algebras they suggest appear to be rather universal [33] and agree also with results from operator calculations in $2+1$-dimensional models [34, 3, 4, 5]. Moment terms have not been included yet in effective calculations of constraint algebras, but our results show that they would not modify or eliminate the deformations. At most, re-ordering terms could lead to $\hbar$-corrections of deformed structure functions. (In the case of holonomy modifications, which according to [24, 26, 27, 28, 34], deform the classical structure functions by a factor depending on the momentum of the spatial metric, the

modified structure functions $f^K_{IJ,\mathrm{reg}}$ no longer depend just on configuration variables.)

Such ordering terms may affect the details of concrete models based on constraint algebras with deformed structure functions, especially in strong quantum regimes. Nevertheless, our main result that moment-dependent quantum back-reaction terms do not affect the leading structure functions has an important consequence also in this context: In all consistent effective models found so far in the presence of holonomy corrections, the deformed structure functions change sign around any local maximum of holonomies as functions of the connection or extrinsic curvature. (The structure functions are proportional to the second derivative of holonomy modification functions [24, 28, 33].) This change of sign can be interpreted as signature change, with a quantum version of 4-dimensional Euclidean space replacing Lorentzian space-time when the structure functions take the opposite sign [6, 7, 8]. Even if holonomy modification functions are subjected to $\hbar$-corrections from factor ordering terms, this general conclusion about signature change remains unaltered. (The only assumption in its derivation is that the classical quadratic dependence of the Hamiltonian constraint on the connection or extrinsic curvature is replaced by some function of the basic expectation values, not necessarily of any specific form such as a sine function often used in this context.) Our results therefore show that moment terms do not affect the central statements about signature change.

As we have discussed in Section 2.2, results about effective constraint algebras are reliable in regimes in which semiclassical approximations of the dynamics may be expected to be poor. One can therefore trust implications of deformed algebras even in the Planck regime. The main such result is signature change at high curvature or density.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by NSF grant PHY-1307408. We thank Juan Reyes for useful comments on a draft of this paper.

References

[1] T. Thiemann, Anomaly-Free Formulation of Non-Perturbative, Four-Dimensional Lorentzian Quantum Gravity, *Phys. Lett. B* 380 (1996) 257–264, [gr-qc/9606088]

[2] T. Thiemann, Quantum Spin Dynamics (QSD), *Class. Quantum Grav.* 15 (1998) 839–873, [gr-qc/9606089]

[3] A. Henderson, A. Laddha, and C. Tomlin, Constraint algebra in LQG reloaded : Toy model of a U(1)^3 Gauge Theory I, *Phys. Rev. D* 88 (2013) 044028, [arXiv:1204.0211]

[4] A. Henderson, A. Laddha, and C. Tomlin, Constraint algebra in LQG reloaded : Toy model of an Abelian gauge theory - II Spatial Diffeomorphisms, *Phys. Rev. D* 88 (2013) 044029, [arXiv:1210.3960]

[5] C. Tomlin and M. Varadarajan, Towards an Anomaly-Free Quantum Dynamics for a Weak Coupling Limit of Euclidean Gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* 87 (2013) 044039, [arXiv:1210.6869]

[6] M. Bojowald and G. M. Paily, Deformed General Relativity and Effective Actions from Loop Quantum Gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* 86 (2012) 104018, [arXiv:1112.1899]

[7] J. Mielczarek, Signature change in loop quantum cosmology, [arXiv:1207.4657]

[8] M. Bojowald, Back to the beginning of quantum spacetime, *Physics Today* 66 (2013) 35

[9] R. Tibrewala, Inhomogeneities, loop quantum gravity corrections, constraint algebra and general covariance, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 31 (2014) 055010, [arXiv:1311.1297]

[10] M. Bojowald, B. Sandhöfer, A. Skirzewski, and A. Tsobanjan, Effective constraints for quantum systems, *Rev. Math. Phys.* 21 (2009) 111–154, [arXiv:0804.3365]

[11] M. Bojowald and A. Tsobanjan, Effective constraints for relativistic quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. D* 80 (2009) 125008, [arXiv:0906.1772]

[12] M. Bojowald, Quantum Cosmology: Effective Theory, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 29 (2012) 213001, [arXiv:1209.3403]

[13] M. Bojowald, Fluctuation energies in quantum cosmology, *Phys. Rev. D* 89 (2014) 124031, [arXiv:1404.5284]

[14] M. Bojowald and A. Tsobanjan, Effective Casimir conditions and group coherent states, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 31 (2014) 115006, [arXiv:1401.5352]

[15] D. Brizuela, A formalism based on statistical moments for classical and quantum dynamics: application to cosmology, [to appear]

[16] M. Bojowald and A. Skirzewski, Effective Equations of Motion for Quantum Systems, *Rev. Math. Phys.* 18 (2006) 713–745, [math-ph/0511043]

[17] M. Bojowald and A. Skirzewski, Quantum Gravity and Higher Curvature Actions, *Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys.* 4 (2007) 25–52, [hep-th/0606232]

[18] M. Bojowald, S. Brahma, and E. Nelson, Higher time derivatives in effective equations of canonical quantum systems, *Phys. Rev. D* 86 (2012) 105004, [arXiv:1208.1242]

[19] M. Bojowald and D. Simpson, Factor ordering and large-volume dynamics in quantum cosmology, [arXiv:1403.6746]

[20] A. Tsobanjan, Semiclassical states on Lie algebras, [in preparation]

[21] M. Bojowald, D. Brizuela, H. H. Hernandez, M. J. Koop, and H. A. Morales-Técotl, High-order quantum back-reaction and quantum cosmology with a positive cosmological constant, *Phys. Rev. D* 84 (2011) 043514, [arXiv:1011.3022]

[22] M. Bojowald, G. Hossain, M. Kagan, and S. Shankaranarayanan, Anomaly freedom in perturbative loop quantum gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* 78 (2008) 063547, [arXiv:0806.3929]

[23] M. Bojowald, J. D. Reyes, and R. Tibrewala, Non-marginal LTB-like models with inverse triad corrections from loop quantum gravity, *Phys. Rev. D* 80 (2009) 084002, [arXiv:0906.4767]

[24] J. D. Reyes, *Spherically Symmetric Loop Quantum Gravity: Connections to 2-Dimensional Models and Applications to Gravitational Collapse*, PhD thesis, The Pennsylvania State University, 2009

[25] A. Kreienbuehl, V. Husain, and S. S. Seahra, Modified general relativity as a model for quantum gravitational collapse, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 29 (2012) 095008, [arXiv:1011.2381]

[26] T. Cailleteau, J. Mielczarek, A. Barrau, and J. Grain, Anomaly-free scalar perturbations with holonomy corrections in loop quantum cosmology, *Class. Quant. Grav.* 29 (2012) 095010, [arXiv:1111.3535]

[27] T. Cailleteau, L. Linsefors, and A. Barrau, Anomaly-free perturbations with inverse-volume and holonomy corrections in Loop Quantum Cosmology, [arXiv:1307.5238]

[28] M. Bojowald, G. M. Paily, and J. D. Reyes, Discreteness corrections and higher spatial derivatives in effective canonical quantum gravity, [arXiv:1402.5130]

[29] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C. W. Misner, The Dynamics of General Relativity, In L. Witten, editor, *Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research*, Wiley, New York, 1962. Reprinted in R. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C. W. Misner, The Dynamics of General Relativity, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* 40 (2008) 1997–2027

[30] S. A. Hojman, K. Kuchař, and C. Teitelboim, Geometrodynamics Regained, *Ann. Phys. (New York)* 96 (1976) 88–135

[31] J. F. Donoghue, General relativity as an effective field theory: The leading quantum corrections, *Phys. Rev. D* 50 (1994) 3874–3888, [gr-qc/9405057]

[32] C. P. Burgess, Quantum Gravity in Everyday Life: General Relativity as an Effective Field Theory, *Living Rev. Relativity* 7 (2004), [gr-qc/0311082], http://www.livingreviews.org/lrr-2004-5

[33] A. Barrau, M. Bojowald, G. Calcagni, J. Grain, and M. Kagan, Anomaly-free cosmological perturbations in effective canonical quantum gravity, [arXiv:1404.1018]

[34] A. Perez and D. Pranzetti, On the regularization of the constraints algebra of Quantum Gravity in 2+1 dimensions with non-vanishing cosmological constant, *Class. Quantum Grav.* 27 (2010) 145009, [arXiv:1001.3292]